

# CHAPTER 4.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

## 4.1 INTRODUCTION

### 4.1.1 Use of an Integrated NEPA/CEQA Document

Use of an integrated Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) is encouraged by both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA and its guidelines have numerous provisions allowing state and local agencies to use an EIS as a substitute for an EIR. This Plan for the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, including the environmental analyses, is consistent with NEPA and CEQA requirements. The Plan in its entirety constitutes an EIS/EIR, as required by NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), CEQA (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.).

### 4.1.2 Purpose and Need

The mission of the California Department of Parks and Recreation is “to provide for the health, inspiration and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation.” General Plans are the primary management document for park units providing broad management direction, in the form of goals and guidelines, for development, public use, ongoing management and resource protection. The General Plan considers the park unit not only in the larger context of the State Park System, but also the specific resource values and planning influences of the individual unit. The Plan attempts to integrate overlapping or potentially conflicting goals into an integrated whole, such as providing opportunities for public enjoyment while also protecting natural and cultural resources.

The current General Plan for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA) was adopted in 1979. Three amendments to this General Plan have been adopted including a 1986 amendment for Nimbus Flat, Nimbus Shoals and Mississippi Bar that was later revised in two separate amendments; a February 1988 amendment for Nimbus Flat and a December

1988 amendment for Nimbus Shoals and Mississippi Bar. Additionally there was a 1996 amendment for Negro Bar, Willow Creek and Beal's Point.

Changes in conditions have occurred since the current General Plan was approved in 1979. The population has increased regionally and within the immediate vicinity. Consequently, the volume and variety of human activities at Folsom Lake State Park has been amplified. These increasingly popular outdoor recreation activities include personal watercraft (jet skis), wake boarding, sailing, rowing, kayaking and other paddling sports, running, jogging, and mountain biking. The increased population and popularized recreational activities have transformed the environment on Folsom Lake, Lake Natoma and the surrounding open space. The regional population intensity is also projected to increase.

A Resource Management Plan (RMP) has never before been prepared for the Reclamation lands associated with Folsom Reservoir and Lake Natoma. The Bureau of Reclamation mission is "to manage, develop and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public." Reclamation's *2000-2005 Strategic Plan* indicates the agency will develop, monitor, and update RMPs for lands directly managed by Reclamation and those managed cooperatively with other agencies. Reclamation authority to prepare RMPs is vested federal reclamation laws including the broad authority of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the more specific authorization in the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992. The purpose of the RMP is to chart the desired future condition for the area in question, with goals, objectives, standards and guidelines with sufficient detail to direct future development, but flexible enough to allow resolution of day-to-day problems. Reclamation land management strategies include responsible management which balances resource development with public recreation and protection of natural and cultural resources and environmental values.

The changes in conditions warrant the need for a new General Plan/Resource Management Plan that includes an EIS/EIR. If the new General Plan/Resource Management Plan is approved, it will supersede all others, including amendments. The purpose of this EIS/EIR is to inform decision-makers and the public about any potentially significant effects that may result from the implementation of the Plan and provide mitigation measures to reduce those potentially significant effects. In addition, the document provides information on any impacts that cannot be avoided; growth-inducing impacts; effects found not to be significant; and cumulative impacts of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

As required under NEPA, the EIS/EIR identifies the proposed action, evaluates potential impacts of each alternative at equal levels of detail, and identifies an environmentally preferable alternative. As required under CEQA, mitigation measures are formatted for inclusion in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as appropriate, and an environmentally superior alternative is identified. This is a Programmatic EIS/EIR for the Plan and does not contain project-specific analysis of projects recommended in the Plan. Because the Plan is a long-range plan, additional management planning, schematic design, and construction documentation would be completed as necessary before improvements are made. At this time, there is not sufficient information available to support a project-specific analysis but future projects will undergo subsequent NEPA/CEQA review as appropriate.

Both CEQA and NEPA encourage agencies to use a tiering process for environmental review of subsequent projects pursuant to or consistent with a general plan. The tiering concept is designed to promote efficiency by eliminating repetitive discussions of general matters contained in a broader EIS/EIR and concentrating solely on issues specific to the later project. Where an EIS/EIR has been prepared and approved for a plan, a lead agency may limit environmental review of the later project to effects which were not examined as significant effects in the prior EIS/EIR or can be substantially reduced or avoided by revisions in the project. The later environmental document is “tiered” or procedurally connected to the large-scale plan EIS/EIR. These assessments may later incorporate by reference the general discussion from the program-level EIS/EIR and concentrate solely on issues specific to later projects. Accordingly this Plan constitutes the first and most general tier of environmental review.

The Draft General Plan/Resource Management Plan (Plan) and EIS/EIR are combined herein as one document. Chapter 2, Existing Conditions, serves as the environmental setting for the environmental analysis. Chapter 3 is a detailed description of the Draft Plan, which is the Preferred Alternative. This Draft Plan is summarized in Chapter 4 as Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, along with the other alternatives considered. Chapter 3 contains complete policy goals and guidelines, management zone descriptions and designations, and serves as the project description. Combining preparation of the Draft Plan with the environmental analysis provides the opportunity to mitigate impacts of the Plan through the goals and guidelines. For impacts that are identified in this section, some of the goals and guidelines from Chapter 3 serve as mitigation as well as those mitigation measures that are noted in this chapter.

Implementation of project-specific development plans will be carried out as funding allows. Each subsequent specific development plan or project will be subject to further, more

detailed environmental review to determine if it is consistent with this Plan and whether this programmatic EIS/EIR adequately addresses impacts of the proposed project. More detailed environmental review to identify significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures specific to the project would be required once details of the project are known rather than at the Plan level.

### 4.1.3 Focus of the EIS/EIR

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) established the focus of this Draft EIS/EIR after considering comments from public agencies and the community regarding the Plan. Reclamation completed a Notice of Intent (NOI) which was published in the Federal Register on January 17, 2003. State Parks completed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) which was filed with the State Clearinghouse on June 24, 2006. In addition, public scoping sessions on the project were held on November 20, 2002 and June 10, 2003 to inform the public of the Plan, solicit comments, and identify areas of concern.

Environmental Effects on the following resource topics were found to be significant and are addressed in Section 4.4 (Environmental Consequences) of this EIS/EIR:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Recreation
- Traffic and Circulation
- Utilities and Public Services

Environmental Effects on the following resource topics were found not to be significant and are addressed in Section 4.4.2 (Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant) of this EIS/EIR:

- Agriculture
- Climate Change
- Energy Conservation
- Environmental Justice
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing

#### 4.1.4 Environmental Review Process

Consistent with NEPA/CEQA requirements, a good-faith effort has been made during the preparation of this EIS/EIR to contact and consult with affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project. This included circulation of an NOI, a NEPA-required notification, which initiated the EIS process and scoping and included a 30-day public comment period at the outset of the planning process. The purpose of the NOP, a CEQA-required notification, was to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and also includes a comment period. Both notifications invite comments on the scope and content of the EIS/EIR.

Upon issuance of this Draft EIS/EIR for public review, Reclamation will file a Notice of Availability (NOA) for placement in the Federal Register to comply with NEPA requirements; and State Parks will file a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, to comply with CEQA requirements and indicate that this Draft Plan and EIS/EIR has been completed and is available for review and comment by the public. The CEQA NOC of the Draft EIR will be published concurrently with distribution of the document followed by a 45-day review period to allow for the public and other agencies to review and comment on the Draft EIS/EIR.

Reviewers of this Draft EIS/EIR should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the potential environmental impacts of the Plan. Comments may be made on the Draft EIS/EIR in writing before the end of the comment period. Following the close of the public review period, Reclamation and State Parks will prepare responses to comments on the content and conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR and will revise the document as necessary to address those comments. The Draft EIS/EIR and technical appendices, together with the responses to comments document (Volume II), will constitute the Final EIS/EIR.

Written comments on the Draft Plan and EIS/EIR should be sent to:

Jim Micheaels  
Staff Park and Recreation Specialist  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Gold Fields District  
7806 Folsom-Auburn Road  
Folsom, CA 95630

or

Laura Caballero  
Environmental Specialist  
Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Central California Area Office  
7794 Folsom Dam Road  
Folsom, CA 95630-1799

Reclamation and State Parks will review the Final EIS/EIR for adequacy and consider it for certification pursuant to the requirements of federal and state NEPA/CEQA Guidelines. The California State Park and Recreation Commission is the entity that will review and approve the Plan and certify the EIR, and the Reclamation's Regional Director of the Mid-Pacific Region will review and approve the Plan and certify the EIS. If State Parks certifies the Final EIR and both State Parks and Reclamation decide to approve the Plan, a Record of Decision (ROD) and Notice of Determination will be prepared and filed with the Federal Register and State Clearinghouse respectively. These will include a description of the project, the date of approval, and the address where the Final EIS/EIR and record of project approval are available for review.

If the EIS/EIR is certified and the project is approved, subsequent environmental review would be limited to the requirements outlined in the adopted mitigation measures for the project. There would also be subsequent Reclamation and State Parks project specific planning to ensure that they are consistent with the Plan. If Reclamation or State Parks, pursuant to 1500.4, 1500.5 and 1502.2 of the NEPA Regulations and §15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, that no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, they can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by this EIS/EIR. In such a case, new environmental documentation may not be required, although a Notice of Exemption (NOE) may be filed under CEQA as dictated by State Parks policy. However, if a proposed phase of the project would have effects that were not examined in this EIS/EIR, preparation of additional environmental document would be required (NEPA Regulations Section 1502.20 and State CEQA Guidelines §15168(c)(1)).

### 4.1.5 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Chapter 3 identifies goals and guidelines for resource management, visitor experience, interpretation and education, local and regional planning, and infrastructure and operations.

The goals and guidelines of the Plan are designed to avoid potential significant effects on the environment.

A summary comparison of the environmental impacts for all of the alternatives is provided in the summary table (Table 1.A) below. This summary is not offered as a definitive description of impacts and mitigations, but as a summary for easy reference. A detailed evaluation of the potential for significant environmental effects to aesthetics/visual resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use, traffic and circulation, recreation resources, noise, and utilities and services systems is provided in Section 4.4.

The environmental analysis prepared for the Plan is programmatic in scope and does not contain project-specific analysis for the facilities recommended in the Plan. However, the Plan also includes guidelines that will govern project-level environmental review of future projects to avoid or minimize any potential adverse site-specific effects to resources during construction or operations of the facilities. Site-specific projects would undergo subsequent NEPA and/or CEQA review in the future as appropriate.

**Table 1.A: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

Resource	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Aesthetics/Visual Resources (Section 4.4.3)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines that would avoid or minimize to a less-than-significant level impacts to visual resources associated with new facilities. Refer to Section 4.4.3.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact VIS-1:</b> New construction within the park unit that would result from Plan implementation could potentially impact existing scenic resources (Significance Criteria VIS-a through VIS-c).		<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)
<b>Impact VIS-2:</b> New construction within the park unit that would result from Plan implementation could create new sources of light or glare (Significance Criteria VIS-d).		<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)
<b>Geology and Soils (Section 4.4.4)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains several guidelines that would avoid or minimize impacts pertaining to geological resources and soils to a less-than significant level. Refer to Section 4.4.4.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact GEO-1:</b> Development and expansion of recreational and interpretive facilities in certain areas of the park could expose visitors to adverse impacts related to landslides (Significance Criterion GEO-a).		<b>Mitigation Measure GEO-1:</b> Prior to approval of the building plans for specific site facilities, as needed and where appropriate, a geotechnical study shall be completed by an engineering geologist or equivalent professional to evaluate surface soil conditions. This report shall include slope geometries, performance of a geotechnical review of final design documents, and provision of oversight by a geotechnical engineer during construction. The project applicant/contractor shall incorporate the recommendations of the geotechnical study into the design for all structures proposed at the site.
<b>Impact GEO-2:</b> The execution of a prescribed burn program and development of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities that would include substantial grading activities could result in soil erosion and dust/asbestos propagation (Significance Criterion GEO-a and GEO-b).		<b>Mitigation Measure GEO-2a:</b> The Unit-wide Burn Plan currently being prepared by State Parks shall address specific site soil conditions susceptible to erosion when recommending prescribed burns.
		<b>Mitigation Measure GEO-2b:</b> Prior to approval of improvement plans for site development, an erosion control plan shall be prepared that includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion. Erosion control measures shall include techniques such as physical and vegetative stabilization measures and runoff diversion measures, retention of vegetation, hydroseeding, geotextiles and mats, and straw bale or sandbag barriers and avoidance of grading activities near water channels to the maximum extent feasible. The project shall also comply with applicable federal and State codes and regulations and adopted standards.
		<b>Mitigation Measure GEO-2c:</b> In order to offset any potential risks of exposure to, or if NOA baring soil or rock is identified during construction activities, the standards identified in Section 93105 of the ATCM For Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, shall be followed as precaution. Air district ordinances will apply as applicable.
<b>Biological Resources (Section 4.4.5)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to biological resources. Refer to Section 4.4.5.2.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact BIO-1:</b> The execution of a prescribed burn program and development of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities that would result from Plan implementation could potentially impact sensitive and special status species either directly or through habitat modification (Significance Criteria BIO-a).		<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1:</b> If one or more special status species are determined to be present, the burn plan shall include provisions for ensuring that burns are conducted in a manner that maintains and promotes habitat for these species.
<b>Impact BIO-2:</b> The development of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities that would result from Plan implementation could potentially have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat, wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.), and other sensitive natural communities in the park (Significance Criteria BIO-b and BIO-c).		<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-2:</b> Prior to implementation, State Parks/Reclamation shall obtain the necessary permits/authorizations from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Regional Water Quality Control Board and CDFG. State Parks/Reclamation and contractor shall adhere to all permit conditions to ensure that impacts are minimized.
<b>Impact BIO-3:</b> The development of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities that would result from Plan implementation could potentially interfere with the movement of native wildlife species or migratory fish through established wildlife corridors (Significance Criteria BIO-d).		<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)



Resource	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Cultural Resources (Section 4.4.6)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to cultural resources. Refer to Section 4.4.6.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact CULT-1:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could affect historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources (Significance Criterion CULT-a through CULT-c).	<b>Mitigation Measure CULT-1a:</b> If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are discovered during project activities, all work within the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be redirected until the archaeological monitor assesses the situation and provides recommendations consistent with State and federal laws. It is recommended that adverse effects to such deposits be avoided by project activities. If such deposits cannot be avoided, they shall be evaluated for their eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources. If the resources are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary, but may still be desirable. If the resources are eligible, they shall be avoided or any adverse effects shall be mitigated consistent with State and federal laws. (Cultural resource reviews conducted in compliance with Section 106 [federal property] and PRC 5024 [State property] will determine procedural conditions and mitigation measures.)	
	<b>Mitigation Measure CULT-1b:</b> If paleontological resources are encountered during project subsurface construction and no monitor is present, all ground-disturbing activities shall be redirected within the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified paleontologist can be contacted to evaluate the find and make recommendations. Scientifically significant paleontological resources shall be protected consistent with State Parks policy (DOM 0309.2). The preference is to avoid impacts to significant paleontological resources. If found to be significant and project activities cannot avoid the paleontological resources, adverse effects to paleontological resources shall be mitigated, which may include monitoring, collection, documentation, and the accession of all fossil material to a paleontological repository as determined by the site-specific evaluation by a qualified paleontologist.	
<b>Impact CULT-2:</b> Development of facilities could potentially impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Significance Criterion CULT-c).	<b>Mitigation Measure CULT-2:</b> Expansion and/or development of additional facilities at Rattlesnake Bar and the Peninsula shall avoid disruption to unique geologic features. During construction, exclusionary ESA fencing and monitoring may be required to prevent inadvertent intrusions by construction activities. Interpretive displays shall also be constructed to inform park visitors of this unique geologic formation.	
<b>Impact CULT-3:</b> Ground-disturbing activities could disturb human remains (Significance Criterion CULT-d).	<b>Mitigation Measure CULT-3:</b> If human remains are encountered, work shall cease in the immediate area of the discovery and the Coroner notified immediately consistent with §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. Any human remains and/or funerary objects shall be left in place. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the situation. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of identification. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify a Native American Most Likely Descendent to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment and disposition of the remains and any associated funerary objects.	
	Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined whether or not the remains are subject to the coroner's authority.	
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 4.4.7)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines that would generally benefit hydrology and water quality and avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts. Refer to Section 4.4.7.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact WATER-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan alternatives would result in the development of additional recreation, interpretive and administrative facilities that could impact water quality (Significance Criterion WATER-a, WATER-e and WATER-f).	<b>Mitigation Measure WATER-1:</b> Site specific development projects, management plans, and Specific Project Plans as identified in the Plan shall develop and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) as necessary and appropriate to control erosion and sedimentation, both during and after construction, thereby reducing water pollution.	
<b>Impact WATER-2:</b> Implementation of the Plan alternatives would result in an increased number of recreation facilities on Folsom Lake that could be inundated during an extreme flood event (Significance Criterion WATER-h and WATER-i).	<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)	
<b>Land Use (Section 4.4.8)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines that would reduce or eliminate potential adverse impacts associated with the combination of land uses that would support varying intensities of use and visitation. Refer to Section 4.4.8.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact LANDUSE-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan alternatives would result in the combination of potentially conflicting land uses, including resource conservation and preservation areas located adjacent to developed recreation areas (Significance Criterion LU-b).	<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)	

Resource	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Recreation Resources (Section 4.4.9)</b>		
<i>In addition to all of the guidelines listed in the other individual resource sections of the environmental analysis, the Plan contains the specific guidelines that would avoid or minimize to a less-than-significant level environmental impacts associated with recreation facilities. Refer to Section 4.4.9.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact REC-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan alternatives would result in the development of additional recreation facilities that could adversely affect the environment (Significance Criterion REC-b).	<b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)	
<b>Traffic/Circulation (Section 4.4.10)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains a guideline to reduce or eliminate potential adverse impacts associated with the generation of increased vehicle trips that would increase congestion on local roadways. Refer to Section 4.4.10.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
<b>Impact TRAFFIC-1:</b> Based on the program level of review, implementation of the Plan would allow the development of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased vehicle trips on area roadways that would cause levels of service to deteriorate (Significance Criteria TRAFFIC-a and TRAFFIC-b).	<b>Mitigation Measure TRAF-1a:</b> To ensure that all traffic impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed program-level Plan are mitigated, traffic impact analyses shall be prepared for any individual project identified as a potential “high” impact in Table 10.C. Project-specific traffic impact analyses shall be prepared in accordance with all applicable provisions of CEQA. When developing the scope of work for each individual traffic study, the standards and procedures of the applicable local agency shall be consulted and applied as necessary. The traffic study shall assess the affects of each project, as well as cumulative projects, and propose fair share mitigation measures as applicable.	
	<b>Mitigation Measure TRAF-1b:</b> The implementation of Alternative 3 would create additional traffic that would result in significant impacts to roadway segments in the existing plus project condition. These impacts have been identified based on a worst-case analysis which assumes that all management zones are implemented at the same time and that no operational improvements or mitigation actions are included as part of the project description. Currently, the DPR takes the following mitigating actions to address traffic problems and congestion during peak season weekends: (1) Public service announcements and press releases when Beal’s Point and Granite bay fill to notify people to arrive early and/or use alternate areas; (2) Use of changeable electronic message signs along Auburn Folsom Road and Douglas Boulevard to inform the public when Beal’s Point and Granite Bay areas are full; (3) Closure of Beal’s Point and Granite Bay day use areas when parking capacity fills; and (4) Use of State Park Rangers and other staff to direct traffic circulation at entrance stations at peak use times.	
	If determined to be necessary through the subsequent traffic analysis required by Mitigation Measure TRAF-1a, roadway improvements, as indicated below, shall mitigated the impacts of Alternative 3. As the proposal for each management area is refined and implemented, subsequent analysis shall be required to fonfirm the need for recommended improvements and to determine the potential for fair-share participation in each specific park/recreation improvement. Project specific and cumulative impacts could also be reduced or eliminated through modification of the project description to provide less land use intensity than provided for in the General Plan or by implementing mitigation actions, such as those listed above, to reduce the potential traffic impact of the project. Other mitigating actions that could be applied to the project as appropriate include staggering the hours of operation and modifying the location of access points to reduce congestion along local roadways. These mitigating actions shall be considered part of the project and evaluated in subsequent traffic analysis required in Mitigation Measure TRAF-1a.	
	If significant project impacts on the indicated roadway segments are still identified when a project-specific traffic impact analysis is prepared, then the project shall participate on a fair-share basis in the widening or improvement of the following affected roadway segments: (1) No Project/Current General Plan: Folsom Boulevard south of Blue Ravine Road - Widen to 6 Lane Arterial; (2) Alternative 3: Green Valley Road west of Salmon Falls Road - Widen to 4 Lane Arterial.	
<b>Impact TRAFFIC-2:</b> Implementation of the Plan would allow the development of additional facilities and site improvements that could create potentially hazardous conditions related to site design features (Significance Criteria TRAFFIC-a and TRAFFIC-b).	<b>Mitigation Measure TRAF-2:</b> Prior to implementation of overflow parking at Nimbus Flat/Nimbus Shoals, a focused circulation and parking analysis shall be prepared. The focused traffic analysis shall analyze the following: (1) Effect of the overflow parking area on local circulation; (2) Adequacy and safety of access to the parking area; and (3) Pedestrian circulation to/from the overflow parking area to activity centers at Nimbus Flat/Nimbus Shoals. Measures to ensure adequate circulation, levels of service and vehicular and pedestrian safety shall be identified and implemented prior to the installation and operation of the overflow parking at Nimbus Flat/Nimbus Shoals.	

Resource	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Air Quality (Section 4.4.11)</b>		
	<p><b>Impact AIRQ-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (Significance Criteria AIRQ-a).</p> <p><b>Impact AIRQ-2:</b> Implementation of the Plan would involve the execution of a prescribed burn program, and construction of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased emissions of air pollutants (Significance Criteria AIRQ-b and AIRQ-d).</p>	<p><b>No Mitigation Required.</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AIRQ-2a:</b> The PCAPCD has not established any emissions threshold for construction activities associated with a proposed project. They only state that implementation of standard conditions and feasible measures to minimize emissions during construction of the project shall be considered to have reduced the construction air quality impact to a less than significant level. The EDCAPCD and SMAQMD have both established emissions thresholds for construction activities as shown in Table 11.G. No Plan-related construction emissions exceedances are expected, as shown in Table 11.G, so no additional mitigation measures shall be required for these latter two air districts. The project shall comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions as applicable: Rule 228 for Fugitive Dust Control (PCAPCD), Rule 223 for Fugitive Dust Control (EDCAPCD), and Rule 403 for Fugitive Dust Control (SMAQMD). Standard district rules require that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source.</p> <p>In addition, implementation of dust suppression techniques is required to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Dust control measures applicable to the appropriate governing agency will be determined for future projects identified by the Plan. Implementation of the dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM10 component). Compliance with these rules shall reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. Emissions associated with architectural coatings shall be reduced by complying with the standards established by the EDCAPCD, PCAPCD and SMAQMD, which include using precoated/natural colored building materials.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AIRQ-2b:</b> In order to offset any potential risks of exposure to, or if NOA is identified during construction activities, the following standards from Section 93105 of the ATCM For Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, shall be followed as precaution.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure AIRQ-3:</b> As discussed in the traffic section, several new facilities are proposed which could generate a significant number of trips and could have a significant impact on the traffic-related air emissions. At this time, these projects have not been defined sufficiently that they can be properly analyzed. Air quality impact analyses shall be prepared as needed consistent with all applicable laws and regulations including CEQA. The air quality impact analysis shall be submitted to the appropriate approving agency for review and approval prior to implementation and use of the new facilities.</p>
	<p><b>Impact AIRQ-3:</b> Implementation of the Plan would involve the operation of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased emissions of air pollutants (Significance Criteria AIRQ-b and AIRQ-d).</p>	
	<p><b>Impact AIRQ-4:</b> Implementation of the Plan would involve the operation of additional facilities and site improvements that could cause CO Hot spots (Significance Criteria AIRQ-b and AIRQ-d).</p> <p><b>Impact AIRQ-5:</b> Implementation of the Plan would not result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (Significance Criteria AIRQ-c).</p>	<p><b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Refer to Plan guidelines. (The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.)</p> <p><b>No Mitigation Required.</b> Less than significant impact.</p>
<b>Noise (Section 4.4.12)</b>		
	<p><b>Impact NOISE-1:</b> The development of additional recreational, interpretive, and administrative facilities that would result from Plan implementation could potentially result in increased noise levels related to increased traffic on local roadways (Significance Criteria NOISE-a and NOISE-d).</p> <p><b>Impact NOISE-2:</b> The construction of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities that would result from Plan implementation could potentially result in increased noise levels (Significance Criteria NOISE-a and NOISE-d).</p> <p><b>Impact NOISE-3:</b> The operation of recreational, interpretive and administrative facilities could potentially result in increased noise levels from non-traffic sources (Significance Criteria NOISE-a and NOISE-d).</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:</b> As discussed in the traffic section, several new facilities are proposed which could generate a significant number of trips and could have a significant impact on the traffic-related noise. At this time, these projects have not been defined sufficiently; therefore, they cannot be properly analyzed. Noise impact analyses shall be prepared as needed consistent with all applicable and appropriate laws, ordinances and regulations including all applicable provisions of CEQA.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2:</b> Individual future development projects specified in the Plan would potentially result in relatively high noise levels and annoyance at the closest residences. Specific noise analyses will be required for these subsequent projects. In anticipation of potential noise impacts from construction, the following measures would reduce short-term construction related noise impacts: (1) During all project site excavation and on-site grading, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards; (2) The project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site; and (3) The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure NOISE-3:</b> Operation of pleasure motor boat engines would potentially result in relatively high noise levels and annoyance at the closest residences. Compliance with the following California State Administrative Codes shall reduce noise impacts to less than significant: (1) California Administrative Code includes Code 4320-Peace and Quiet; and (2) California Administrative Code 654.05, California Harbors and Navigation Code.</p>

Resource	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Hazardous Materials (Section 4.4.13)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines to address issues related to hazardous materials. Refer to Section 4.4.13.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
	<p><b>Impact HAZ-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan would involve the construction of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased emissions of air pollutants including airborne NOA particulates resulting from clearing and grading activities (Significance Criterion HAZ-a and HAZ-b).</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:</b> In order to offset any potential risks of exposure to, or if NOA is identified during construction activities, the following standards from Section 93105 of the ATCM For Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, shall be followed as precaution. (Refer to Section 4.4.4, Geology and Soils, and Section 4.4.11, Air Quality, for additional information.) The potential for encountering NOA during project construction within the Unit would be mitigated to a less-than-significant impact by the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, per California's dust abatement guidelines for asbestos. Future projects resulting from Plan implementation shall comply with the fugitive dust measures established by the three air district asbestos as applicable. If necessary, Phase I and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessments shall be conducted to further determine impacts and prescribe mitigation measures for airborne asbestos.</p>
	<p><b>Impact HAZ-2:</b> Implementation of the Plan could involve the construction of additional facilities and site improvements in the vicinity of abandoned chromium mines resulting in potential water quality issues or the exposure of construction workers to particulate matter containing hexavalent chromium (Significance Criteria HAZ-a and HAZ-b).</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2:</b> Proposed site improvements or construction activities in areas of the Unit that may contain chromate deposits shall undergo a Phase I and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessment conducted by a qualified environmental professional to ascertain any potential impacts to sensitive receptors and water quality. Any activity that involves any on-site movement of a hazardous material is a process subject to California Code of Regulations. Should any hazardous substances or other health hazards be identified, appropriate warning and protective methods would be developed and implemented.</p>
<b>Utilities and Service Systems (Section 4.4.14)</b>		
<i>The Plan contains specific guidelines to address issues related to utilities and service systems. Refer to Section 4.4.14.3.1. The No Project Alternative would not implement Plan guidelines.</i>		
	<p><b>Impact UTIL-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan would allow the development of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased demand for additional water, wastewater, electricity, gas, telephone, and solid waste disposal services (Significance Criteria UTIL-f through UTIL-i).</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure UTIL-1a:</b> Prior to implementation, site specific development projects and management plans, as identified in the Plan, shall be submitted to and reviewed by the applicable Public Works Department in Sacramento County, Placer County, El Dorado County, and/or the City of Folsom to determine if adequate water pressure can be provided. If adequate water pressure cannot be provided, project location and design components shall be adapted as necessary.</p>
		<p><b>Mitigation Measure UTIL-1b:</b> Prior to implementation, projected visitation and facility size information for site specific development projects shall be submitted to and reviewed by the applicable Public Works Department in Sacramento County, Placer County, El Dorado County, and/or the City of Folsom to determine if sufficient public sewer service is available. If adequate public sewer service is not available, project location and design components shall be adapted as necessary.</p>